UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,930	09/19/2003	Randy Burnworth	TAYL08-00002	6824
23990 DOCKET CLE	7590 01/15/201 RK	EXAMINER		
P.O. DRAWER		LEE, MICHAEL		
DALLAS, TX	75380		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@munckcarter.com munckcarter@gmail.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/665,930	BURNWORTH, RANDY		
Examiner	Art Unit		
M. Lee	2622		

	M. Lee	2622	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 December 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lateral 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremed and continuous calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	•	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/M. Lee/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2622	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the style information and font identifier in text data 206 of Werner cannot correspond to the pointing information because it does not point to either the style information or the font identifier. The Examiner disagrees. Each of the style information and font identifier is data word that points to a particular memory or map location of a desired style or font. The style information itself cannot reproduce the desired style without referring to a map. For instance, in paragraph 0039, Werner states that the style data in text data 206 may include font identifier and /or definition information, color, and /or size in which text may be displayed...the style data may select larger font sizes, capital letters, and italics for portions of text data 206. In paragraph 0040, Werner further states that the processor builds an image frame and a bitmap for subtitle text data 206...the processor may also apply style data and/or control data to subtitle text data 206 as it is presented with subsequent associated image frames. In paragraph 0031, Werner states that these bitmaps may then be used to display subtitle text data in one or more caption packets 100-110 with one or more image frames. The bitmap built by the processor clearly meets the style information as claimed since it must include an identifier to be identified by the style data in text 206.

Applicant further argues that Werner's pixel bitmap or "style information" does not comprise "location information on a region of the screen on which the subtitle is output by the reproducing apparatus" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner disagrees. In paragraph 0040, Werner states that the processor may build an image frame and a bitmap for subtitle text data 206...then the processor may, for example, overlay the subtitle text data 206 on top of the frame buffer. The bitmap built or generated by the processor has all the coordinates or location information required to overlay on top of the image frame. That is, the frame size of the bitmap is the same as the image frame, and every pixel in between the two are correspondingly aligned from 0 to N both horizontally and vertically. Since the bitmap is built on the Cartesian coordinate system, the location or locations of the text data 206 can be defined by X and Y values. Thus, the bitmap in Werner inherently include location information and the claimed limitation is clearly met.

Applicant argues that it is not seen where paragraph or any other paragraph of Werner discloses or suggests that two or more subtitles are placed on the screen at the same time as claimed. The Examiner disagrees.

In paragraph 0037, Werner states that text data 206 may include a plurality of portions representing lines for a plurality of characters...Each of these portions may be associated with the same...image frame(s). In other words, Werner states that multiple subtitle lines are presented on the same image frame, which clearly meets the limitation as claimed.

Above arguments are supplemented in view of Mr. Randy Serville's telephone conversation dated 1/5/10.